

I see my friend from Iowa is here.

I urge setting those issues before us and moving to resolve them in a fashion that is best for this country.

I yield the floor.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The Legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no further proceedings at this time on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1397 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes twenty seconds.

#### ENERGY POLICY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to expand a little bit on the question of energy policy. As I mentioned before, there certainly have been some changes in the California situation. There have been some changes throughout the country in gas prices and other kinds of energy prices. They are not significant changes and, indeed, now we see them moving back again.

The point we do not want to overlook is that when we had what we called an energy crisis 6 or 8 months ago, we had a problem; and the problem basically, of course, was that demand was growing but supply was not. We had a problem in terms of the amount of refining capacity in this country. It had not grown for a very long time. The same was true with electric generation.

We overcame that problem largely, I suppose, because, among other things, winter was over and some of the refineries that had to make fuel oil for New England had changed their production. But the fact is, the problem is still there. We do need an energy policy.

I urge that we do move forward. The President has put forth a policy—and much of it is incorporated in what has passed in the House—that I think makes a lot of sense. It includes conservation, having some opportunities for conservation in the usage of energy. There are many things we could do in

that area. We can do it as individuals and we can do it as governments and still continue to be productive. Conservation should be part of our energy plan. There are many groups that believe conservation is very important.

One of the other areas of energy policy has to do with renewable energy. We have renewables that are growing. We have wind energy, hydroenergy, and other kinds of energy that I suppose have potential for the future. Outside of hydro, renewables now represent about 1 percent of our total energy usage, but, nevertheless, we ought to be doing something in that area. To do that, of course, we need research and research dollars.

Our committee has already dealt with research, but there needs to be a considerable amount of research in the whole area of conservation, of renewables, of how to have more efficient production with less impact on the environment. So that is a very real part of energy research.

Then, of course, the real key is production. We have allowed ourselves in the energy production field to become dependent on OPEC. Nearly 60 percent of our energy resources now come from overseas. When they change their views, or when things happen over in those countries, it impacts our economy and our society.

We need to have an opportunity to increase production and to do it with diversity so we can use various kinds of energy, which includes coal. Part of the research is to make coal even more clean in terms of the air. We need to have diversity in terms of using gas, coal, nuclear, oil, and renewables so we do not find ourselves becoming dependent on one source.

Unfortunately, the plans that were sort of underway for having additional generating plants almost all had to do with natural gas. Natural gas is a good source of energy, but our largest energy resource is coal. If we can continue to make coal even more clean, why, certainly that is a source of energy that ought to be used for generation.

Also, we have not built generation plants for a very long time. Part of the reason for that is because of the uncertainty of some reregulation and ideas that are out there. In the past, when utilities served a particular area, they produced and generated the electricity. That was a pretty simple arrangement. Now we find more people looking at generation as a marketable commodity. It does not have to be tied to any particular area. But what is the secret to making that work? More transportation. More transmission.

If you cannot move energy from the place it is developed and manufactured to where the markets are, of course, then that is part of the problem. The main source in the West for coal and gas has been the Mountain States area: Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and New Mexico. But in order to get it to the market, you have to have transmission

capacity, particularly if you have mine mouth which is very efficient. So these are issues that need to be dealt with in terms of an energy policy.

One of the issues in terms of transmission capacity is to have a nationwide grid so electric power can be moved across the country and can be moved into the RTOs, the regional transmission organizations, and become an efficient transmitter of energy. We can, in fact, do that.

I believe there needs to be an emphasis on this energy question between now and the time we adjourn so we can get into the field and begin to make some difference in terms of where our energy sources are coming from so we can continue to have reasonably priced energy in order to fuel an economy that we would like to have, which obviously is necessary in order to do that.

So I am hopeful that as we set our priorities for where we go we will include that in the very near future. We have talked about it a great deal. I think actually in a lot of ways there isn't a lot of controversy. There has been controversy, of course, in relation to having access to public lands and the idea of protecting the environment which has to go with energy development.

Some have used ANWR up in the north region as a poster child for not getting into public lands. The fact is, the House-passed provision is 2,000 acres out of 19 million that would be accessible for a footprint. So we are pretty close to some agreements on how we can set this country forward in terms of a source and an opportunity to have affordable energy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have another subject upon which I am going to speak. I do want to make a couple of comments on the statements made by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

This last couple weeks has been somewhat troublesome to me because we have all been spread around the country not able to respond to the President who, of course, has the ability to speak from any place in the world. What has concerned me a great deal is the President and his Director of Budget Mitch Daniels talking about this great surplus we have, the second largest surplus in the history of the country. They failed to mention the surplus is all Social Security surplus.

Of course, we have a surplus because Social Security is not something that is funded as we go along. We forward fund Social Security. We have huge amounts of money coming into the Social Security trust fund today that we are not paying out. That is the way it was planned in 1983 when there was a compromise reached by Tip O'Neill, Ronald Reagan, Claude Pepper, and a few others. So people, including the President of the United States, who talk about this huge surplus are not being fair to the American public.

We do not have a surplus. The surplus is a Social Security surplus. The economy is in a tremendous downturn. This country's tax revenues are significantly lower than they have been in a long time. We have had 8 years where we have brought down the debt.

In fact, the 1993 budget deficit reduction act, passed in the House without a single Republican vote, passed in the Senate without a single Republican vote—Vice President Gore had to break the tie—put this country on a road to economic stability. We have 300,000 fewer Federal jobs than we had in 1993. We have a surplus that we have never had before. And that is as a result of the efforts of President Clinton and his Democratic colleagues in the House and the Senate.

We have experienced inflation lower than it has been in some 40-odd years. We have done remarkably good things with the economy, created 24 million new jobs, in the 8 years it took us to do that. It has been 8 months that this administration has been in office, and they have taken this away from us, in effect. Social Security surplus moneys were once used to mask the Federal deficit. We stopped doing that. But now the second Bush Presidency is using Social Security surpluses to again mask this deficit.

I can't imagine how anyone can come on the floor and say with a straight face that we have the second largest surplus in the history of the country, unless they are candid and say that it is as a result of the Social Security surplus. That is what it is all about. I hope my friend from Illinois has an opportunity today; I know he has some things to say about this.

But let's also talk about energy policy. One of the biggest robberies in the history of this country took place in Congress the last week that the House was in session when they passed the energy bill. The reason I say it was a robbery is because people who voted for that bill thought that they had limited the drilling in ANWR to 2,000 acres. That is a big diversion from the truth.

The fact is, they now allow them to have 2,000 acres of oil derricks all over the Arctic national wilderness. That is what they would allow, 2,000 acres of equipment. This could cover 150,000, 200,000 acres of pristine wilderness.

There are some of us who believe so strongly about this drilling in the Arctic national wilderness that we will do just about anything to stop it from happening. We are not going to let them drill in the Arctic wilderness. We are not going to let them pull this phony situation where they say we are only going to drill on 2,000 acres when, in fact, the legislation states that they are going to allow oil equipment on 2,000 acres.

We don't have a surplus. We are not going to allow drilling in ANWR.

#### RED LIGHT CAMERAS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I first got out of law school, I had a part-time

job. I was a city attorney for the city of Henderson. Henderson at the time was a suburb of Las Vegas and a relatively small community. Now, by Nevada standards, it is a large city, the second largest city in Nevada, approaching about 250,000 people.

When I was city attorney, one of the things I did was prosecute people convicted of misdemeanors, but one of the big jobs I had was prosecuting drunk drivers. Prosecuting drunk drivers was very difficult because a police officer would stop somebody and say: OK, put your finger to your nose, walk on the line—all these things they had people do who were suspected of drunk driving. They would come in and the person charged would say: I hadn't had anything to drink; I don't know why I was arrested. And the police officer would say: His eyes were bloodshot; I could smell liquor on his breath. It was a factual issue as to whether or not that person had been drinking.

After I was city attorney, along came some new procedures. You could breathe into a piece of equipment and it would determine how much alcohol was in your system or an even more sure-fire way was blood alcohol tests. That way the driver was protected. The driver was protected because the driver no longer had to depend on some police officer who may have been mad at him, may have had some personal grudge with him, may have not liked the kind of car he was driving or the color of his skin. Now this person driving could have a blood test administered and show that he was not drinking or they could breathe into a balloon and a breathometer would tell whether or not he had anything to drink—scientific advancements to protect not only the accused but also to protect the State.

When I decided to run for Congress at the beginning of the 1980s, one of the people who I recognized was doing some really good things for many years was a Congressman from New York by the name of James Scheuer. What had Congressman Scheuer done that attracted my attention? He gave speeches around the country and in Congress on the need for police officers to have more scientific equipment to keep up with the more scientific criminals. I thought this was intriguing. I thought it was true. Having been a prosecutor and having been a defense attorney, I recognized that was true.

I was able as a defense attorney to do a lot of things to really hinder the process. That was part of my job. And because we were more in tune with modern scientific things we could hold up warrants and all kinds of things. But we have gotten more modern. We have electronic warrants that are now available. We have video arraignments for people charged with crimes. We have SWAT teams, special weapons people who come in and in a special situation can really go into a building, which is safer for the people in the neighborhood. These people are experts

at getting into buildings. They are experts at negotiating with people.

As I speak, there is a situation going on since the weekend. In Michigan, one person has been killed. There is another person negotiating in this compound. These are experts that are doing the negotiating. In effect, we have become more modern. We are doing a better job of law enforcement. We are doing a better job keeping up with the criminal element. That is why I want to bring to the Senate's attention the promise of something I think is in keeping with what I believe is the direction law enforcement should go. That is photo enforcement of traffic laws.

Each year there are about 2,000 deaths and probably about 250,000 injuries in crashes involving motorists who ignore red lights. More than half of these deaths are pedestrians or passengers in other vehicles who are hit by these people who run the red lights. Between 1992 and 1998, about 1.5 million people were injured in these accidents. It is easy for us to talk about injuries as compared to deaths; maybe they had a broken arm, maybe a whiplash. But lots of these people are confined to wheelchairs. Lots of these people are injured irreparably. They have been hurt so bad their life is never going to be the same, as a result of people trying to save the second or two running a red light.

We have all witnessed it. Probably, we have truthfully all run a red light or two. The signal changes to yellow and vehicles continue to pass through the intersection with little hesitation. The light turns red and one or two more cars blow past in a hurry, speeding through intersections until the last possible second. Unfortunately, experience has taught us that we can get away with it.

For example, there are about a thousand intersections with traffic signals in the greater Las Vegas area. Odds are very good that the police won't be watching when we drive through an intersection a little too late. Nevadans have paid a high price for this daredevil driving. Las Vegas ranks 12th in the Nation in deaths attributed to motorists running red lights.

I can't help but think that Las Vegas streets, as well as streets nationwide, would be a lot safer if there were consequences for running red lights. What if there were a traffic officer at every intersection, all 1,000 intersections where there are red lights in Las Vegas? Let's say there was a traffic officer, or at least that were a possibility. The District of Columbia found out that they can do that. In 1999—and I have spoken to the chief as late as this morning—the District began using cameras to catch motorists running red lights. Thirty other districts in the country have similar laws.

For those unfamiliar with photo enforcement, most use cameras after the light has turned red. A photo of the infraction or violation is taken and later